

Application No.: 10/676454

Case No.: 58611US002

REMARKS**I. Interview Summary**

On May 4, 2006 Examiner Ahmad and Applicant's representative, Trisha Adamson (Reg. No.: 55,860) conducted a telephone interview to discuss the pending claims and the reference cited in the final office action dated March 7, 2006. Discussion regarded the adhesive composition disclosed in the reference. Agreement was not reached.

II. Rejection of the Claims

Applicant has canceled claims 1 to 17 and has not further amended pending claims 18 to 35. Therefore, no additional search on the part of the Examiner is necessary. Applicant respectfully request Examiner to fully consider the presented arguments regarding the patentability of remaining claims 18 to 35 over Jones et al.

Independent claims 18-22 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (US Patent 5,882,789). To anticipate a claim a single prior art reference much teach each and every element of the claims.

Both independent claims 18 and 27 are directed to a tape roll for removing debris from a surface to be cleaned. As is explicitly required by each claim, the tape roll comprises a plurality of tape layers, each tape layer removable from an adjacent underlying layer and an adhesive coating. The adhesive coating consisting essentially of an elastomer and at least about 56% by weight tackifier, adhered to an outer surface of each layer.

Both claims 18 and 27 are directed to a roll of tape with the adhesive coating on the outer surface of the tape roll. Such a tape roll is suitable as a lint roller. Claim 18 recites that that the adhesive coating of the outermost tape layer removes debris from the surface to be cleaned without substantially unwinding from the adjacent underlying layer. Claim 27 recites that the adhesive coating adheres debris contained on the surface to be cleaned to an outermost tape layer without substantially adhering the outermost tape layer to the surface to be cleaned.

Jones is cited for disclosing the claimed adhesive formulation. However, each of claims 18 and 27 require more than simply the adhesive formulation. As stated above, each of claims 18 and 27 is clearly directed to a tape roll with the adhesive coating on the outer surface of the tape roll. Jones does not teach or suggest the adhesive for use in a tape roll and particularly for a tape roll with the adhesive coating on the outer surface of the tape roll.

Application No.: 10/676454

Case No.: 58611US002

In Jones, the adhesive 22 is on a strip 10 and is positioned at least between a first sealant layer 24 and second sealant layer 26 (FIGS. 3-5). Additional sealant layers may also be present (FIGS. 6-10). Because the strip 10 always has sealant layers, the adhesive is not in a roll form with an adhesive coating on the outer surface. Referring to FIG. 14, the strip 10 is placed between base 12. Although at the feed the strip 10 is in a roll, there is not an adhesive coating on the outer surface because the sealant layers contain and protect the adhesive (refer to FIGS. 3, 6 - 10).

The adhesive of claims 18 and 27 is claimed in combination of a tape roll where the adhesive coating is on the outer surface of the tape roll. This claimed adhesive is particularly suited for a lint roller because the adhesive coating of the outermost tape layer removes debris from the surface to be cleaned without substantially unwinding from the adjacent underlying layer (see claim 18), or the adhesive coating adheres debris contained on the surface to be cleaned to an outermost tape layer without substantially adhering the outermost tape layer to the surface to be cleaned (see claim 27).

Jones does not teach or suggest any such combination of an adhesive for use in a tape roll with the adhesive coating on the outer surface. Therefore, because Jones does not teach each and every element of independent claim 18 and 27, claims 18 and 27 are not anticipated by Jones. Claims 19-26 depend from claim 18, and 28-35 depend from claim 27. Therefore, because independent claims 18 and 27 are not anticipated by Jones, dependent claims 19-26 and 28-35 are also not anticipated.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Trisha D. Adamson, Reg. No.: 55,860
Telephone No.: 651-736-9296

5-5-2006
Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833